



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

November 14, 2016

Ms. Sarah W. Langlois
Counsel for the Harris County Department of Education
Rogers Morris & Grover
5718 Westheimer Road, Suite 1200
Houston, Texas 77057

OR2016-25341

Dear Ms. Langlois:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under the Public Information Act (the "Act"), chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 634302.

The Harris County Department of Education (the "department"), which you represent, received a request for records pertaining to the department's legal fees in relation to the requestor. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.103, 552.107, and 552.111 of the Government Code and privileged under Texas Rule of Evidence 503.¹ We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.²

Initially, we note the submitted information is subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code. Section 552.022(a) provides, in relevant part:

¹Although you raise section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with Texas Rule of Evidence 503, this office has concluded that section 552.101 does not encompass discovery privileges. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 676 at 1-2 (2002), 575 at 2 (1990).

²We assume the "representative sample" of records submitted to this office is truly representative of the requested records as a whole. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 499 (1988), 497 (1988). This open records letter does not reach, and therefore does not authorize the withholding of, any other requested records to the extent those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

(a) [T]he following categories of information are public information and not excepted from required disclosure unless made confidential under this chapter or other law:

...

(16) information that is in a bill for attorney's fees and that is not privileged under the attorney client privilege[.]

Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(16). The submitted information consists of attorney-fee bills that are subject to section 552.022(a)(16). This information must be released unless it is made confidential under the Act or other law. Although you raise sections 552.103, 552.107 and 552.111 of the Government Code for the submitted information, these exceptions are discretionary in nature and do not make information confidential under the Act. *See Dallas Area Rapid Transit v. Dallas Morning News*, 4 S.W.3d 469, 475-76 (Tex. App.—Dallas 1999, no pet.) (governmental body may waive section 552.103); Open Records Decision Nos. 677 at 8-10 (2002) (governmental body may waive attorney work product privilege under section 552.111), 676 at 10-11 (governmental body may waive attorney-client privilege under section 552.107(1)), 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally), 663 at 5 (1999) (waiver of discretionary exceptions), 470 at 7 (1987) (deliberative process privilege under statutory predecessor to section 552.111 subject to waiver). Therefore, the department may not withhold any of the submitted information under section 552.103, 552.107, or 552.111. We note you also seek to withhold the information at issue under rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence. The Texas Supreme Court has held the Texas Rules of Evidence and the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure are "other law" that make information expressly confidential for the purposes of section 552.022. *See In re City of Georgetown*, 53 S.W.3d 328, 336 (Tex. 2001). Therefore, we will consider your argument under rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence and your assertion of the attorney work product privilege under rule 192.5 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure.

Texas Rule of Evidence 503(b)(1) provides as follows:

A client has a privilege to refuse to disclose and to prevent any other person from disclosing confidential communications made to facilitate the rendition of professional legal services to the client:

(A) between the client or the client's representative and the client's lawyer or the lawyer's representative;

(B) between the client's lawyer and the lawyer's representative;

(C) by the client, the client's representative, the client's lawyer, or the lawyer's representative to a lawyer representing another party in a

pending action or that lawyer's representative, if the communications concern a matter of common interest in the pending action;

(D) between the client's representatives or between the client and the client's representative; or

(E) among lawyers and their representatives representing the same client.

TEX. R. EVID. 503(b)(1). A communication is "confidential" if it is not intended to be disclosed to third persons other than those to whom disclosure is made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the client or those reasonably necessary for the transmission of the communication. *Id.* 503(a)(5).

Thus, in order to withhold attorney-client privileged information from disclosure under rule 503, a governmental body must (1) show the document is a communication transmitted between privileged parties or reveals a confidential communication; (2) identify the parties involved in the communication; and (3) show the communication is confidential by explaining it was not intended to be disclosed to third persons and it was made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the client. Upon a demonstration of all three factors, the information is privileged and confidential under rule 503, provided the client has not waived the privilege or the document does not fall within the purview of the exceptions to the privilege enumerated in rule 503(d). *See Pittsburgh Corning Corp. v. Caldwell*, 861 S.W.2d 423, 427 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1993, orig. proceeding).

You assert the portions of the submitted fee bills you have marked should be withheld under rule 503. You assert the submitted fee bills include privileged attorney-client communications between the attorneys representing the department and the department in its capacity as a client. You state the communications at issue were made for the purpose of the rendition of legal services to the department. You state the communications at issue were not intended to be disclosed to third parties and have not been disclosed to third parties. Based on your representations and our review of the information at issue, we find you have established some of the information you have marked constitutes attorney-client communications under rule 503. Thus, with the exception of the information we have marked for release, the department may withhold the information you have marked within the submitted attorney fee bills under rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence.³ However, we find you have not demonstrated the remaining information at issue documents an attorney-client communication for purposes of rule 503. We note an entry stating a memorandum or an e-mail was prepared or drafted does not demonstrate the document was

³As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining argument against disclosure of this information.

communicated to the client. Accordingly, the department may not withhold any of the remaining information at issue on that basis.

Rule 192.5 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure encompasses the attorney work-product privilege. For purposes of section 552.022 of the Government Code, information is confidential under rule 192.5 only to the extent the information implicates the core work-product aspect of the work-product privilege. *See* ORD 677 at 9–10. Rule 192.5 defines core work product as the work product of an attorney or an attorney’s representative, developed in anticipation of litigation or for trial, that contains the mental impressions, opinions, conclusions, or legal theories of the attorney or the attorney’s representative. *See* TEX. R. CIV. P. 192.5(a), (b)(1). Accordingly, in order to withhold attorney core work product from disclosure under rule 192.5, a governmental body must demonstrate the material was (1) created for trial or in anticipation of litigation and (2) consists of the mental impressions, opinions, conclusions, or legal theories of an attorney or an attorney’s representative. *Id.*

The first prong of the work product test, which requires a governmental body to show the information at issue was created in anticipation of litigation, has two parts. A governmental body must demonstrate (1) a reasonable person would have concluded from the totality of the circumstances surrounding the investigation there was a substantial chance litigation would ensue and (2) the party resisting discovery believed in good faith there was a substantial chance litigation would ensue and conducted the investigation for the purpose of preparing for such litigation. *See Nat’l Tank v. Brotherton*, 851 S.W.2d 193, 207 (Tex. 1993). A “substantial chance” of litigation does not mean a statistical probability, but rather “that litigation is more than merely an abstract possibility or unwarranted fear.” *Id.* at 204. The second part of the work-product test requires the governmental body to show the materials at issue contain the mental impressions, opinions, conclusions, or legal theories of an attorney or an attorney’s representative. *See* TEX. R. CIV. P. 192.5(b)(1). A document containing core work-product information that meets both parts of the work product test is confidential under rule 192.5, provided the information does not fall within the scope of the exceptions to the privilege enumerated in rule 192.5(c). *See Pittsburgh Corning Corp. v. Caldwell*, 861 S.W.2d 423, 427 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1993, orig. proceeding). Upon review, we find none of the remaining information at issue consists of an attorney’s core work product. Accordingly, the department may not withhold any of the remaining information at issue under rule 192.5 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure.

In summary, with the exception of the information we have marked for release, the department may withhold the information you have marked under rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence. The department must release the remaining information.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular information at issue in this request and limited to the facts as presented to us; therefore, this ruling must not be relied upon as a previous determination regarding any other information or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For more information concerning those rights and responsibilities, please visit our website at http://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open/orl_ruling_info.shtml, or call the Office of the Attorney General's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. Questions concerning the allowable charges for providing public information under the Act may be directed to the Office of the Attorney General, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Meredith L. Coffman', with a long, sweeping horizontal line extending to the right.

Meredith L. Coffman
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

MLC/bw

Ref: ID# 634302

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)